

Plaintiff primarily takes issue with the magistrate judge's characterization of his motion as a discovery motion, and largely repeats the arguments made originally, which have been appropriately rejected. Plaintiff also argues that treating his Motion for Evidentiary Sanctions as a discovery motion is in conflict with governing law permitting "sanctions for spoliation of evidence and/or Rule 37 violations even when discovered after the close of discovery or at trial." Objection at 8. This authority is inapposite. By Plaintiff's own admission, he discovered the purported tampering April 11, 2024—prior to the close of discovery. Motion at 8 ("On April 11, 2024 IBS admitted to tampering with the metadata of the 57 photo files"). He failed to bring his motion then or seek amendment of the Amended Scheduling Order at that time.

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion (Dkt. 120) is DENIED.

Dated: February 25, 2025

MAAME EWUSI-MENSAH FRIMPONG United States District Judge